This response is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed on March 17, 2008. Claims 1-34 were pending at the time the Office Action was issued. Applicant hereby amends Claims 1, 5-6, 9, 13-14, 17, 19-20, 22-23, 25, 30, and 33. Claims 1-34 remain pending.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. 7,093,005 to Patterson et al. (hereinafter "Patterson"). Respectfully, Applicant submits that the claims are allowable over Patterson for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

Claims 1-12

Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1. Claim 1 recites:

1.   A method comprising:
       obtaining a current configuration from a target server, the
          current configuration including one or more roles that
          the target server is capable of performing;
       assigning one of the one or more roles to the target server
          that the target server is capable of performing;
       identifying one or more services associated with the one
          assigned role;
       identifying one or more ports associated with the one
          assigned role;
       presenting the identified services and ports associated with
          the one assigned role to a user; and
       requesting the user to select among the identified ports for
          activation in the target server.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. First, Patterson does not teach or suggest, "obtaining a current configuration from a target server, the

current configuration including *one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing,*" as claimed in Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Instead, Patterson discloses developing a "textural representation" that comprises at least one "server role definition" that is applied to a server. (Column 3, Lines 17-29; Column 4, Lines 14-28) Patterson also discloses saving a "server image" as a blueprint ("DNA") that facilitates the creation of additional servers of the same role. (Column 9, Lines 9-54). However, Patterson is silent with respect to obtaining a current configuration from a server, wherein the "current configuration" includes *"one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing,"* as claimed in Claim 1.

Second, Patterson does not teach or suggest, "assigning one of the one or more roles to the target server *that the target server is capable of performing,*" as claimed in Claim 1. (Emphasis added). As stated above, Patterson discloses providing at least one "server role definition" that is applied to a server. (Column 4, Lines 14-28). However, Patterson does not disclose taking into account the server roles that the server is capable of performing. Accordingly, Patterson does disclose this element, as claimed in Claim 1.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, the method claimed in claim 1 is not anticipated by Patterson. Moreover, since Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1, they are allowable over the cited reference to Patterson at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations claimed.

Specifically, Claim 6 is further allowable over Patterson. Claim 6, as amended, recites:

> 6. A method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising:
>   identifying an operating system level of a target server;

determining one or more security levels for the target
    server based on the identified operating system level of
    the target server; and
selecting one of the one or more security levels for the
    target server; and
identifying at least one role for the target server based on
    the selected security level,
wherein the assigning includes assigning one of the one or
    more roles that is also one of the at least one role.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Patterson does not teach or disclose every aspect of Claim 6. First, Patterson does not teach or suggest, "identifying at least *one role* for the target server *based on the selected security level*," as claimed in Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

The Office Action states, "Web server roles may be defined based on OS and application of the server and cloning a web server implies setting the security level in such a way it can be accessed remotely. See port well know port 80 in figure 4C." (Office Action, Page 4, Paragraph 3, Lines 9-12).

While Patterson does teach setting port settings 439B, *i.e.,* port 80, once a server has been selected for a particular role, *e.g.*, a web server, Patterson does not disclose identifying a particular role for a server based on a selected security level in the *first place.* (Column 9, Lines 54-62; Column 28, Lines 43-54). Put it another way, the configuration of security settings for a server (such as by changing port settings for remote access) after it has been selected for a certain role (*e.g.*, web server) is not the same as identifying possible roles for the server based on a selected security level of the server at the first instance.

Second, because Patterson does not teach or suggest the above element as claimed in Claim 6, Patterson also cannot teach or suggest, "wherein the assigning includes assigning one of the one or more roles that is also one of the at least one

role," as further claimed in Claim 6. Accordingly, Claim 6 is further allowable over Patterson.

<u>Claims 13-18</u>

Claims 14-18 depend from Claim 13. Claim 13, as amended, recites:

> 13. A method comprising:
> obtaining a current configuration from a target server, the current configuration including one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing;
> assigning one of the one or more roles to the target server that the target server is capable of performing;
> identifying one or more services associated with the one assigned role;
> displaying the identified services associated with the one assigned role;
> allowing a user to modify the displayed services;
> identifying the modified services as active services and identifying unmodified services as inactive services;
> generating an output file that includes identities of the active services; and
> transforming the output file into at least one of one or more native scripts or one or more configuration files for application on the target server.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. First, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Patterson does not teach or suggest, as claimed in Claim 13:

> obtaining a current configuration from a target server, the current configuration including *one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing*;
> assigning one of the one or more roles to the target server that the target server *is capable of performing*. (Emphasis added).

Second, Patterson does not teach or even suggest, "transforming the output file into at least one of one or more *native scripts* or one or more *configuration files* for application on the target server," as claimed in Claim 13. (Emphasis added). While Patterson discloses saving a "server image" as a blueprint ("DNA") that facilitates the creation of additional servers of the same role, Patterson does not disclose transforming its blueprint ("DNA") into native scripts and configuration files. Accordingly, Patterson does not teach or suggest this element of Claim 13.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, the method claimed in Claim 13 is not anticipated by Patterson. Moreover, since Claims 14-18 depend from Claim 13, they are allowable over the cited reference to Patterson at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations claimed.

Claims 19-24

Claims 20-24 depend from Claim 19. Claim 19, as amended, recites:

19.   A method comprising:
obtaining a current configuration from a target server, the current configuration including one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing;
assigning one of the one or more roles to the target server that the target server is capable of performing;
identifying one or more ports associated with the one assigned role;
presenting the identified ports associated with the one assigned role to a user;
requesting the user to select among the identified ports associated with the role; and
identifying the selected ports as active ports and identifying unselected ports as inactive ports;
generating an output file that includes identities of the active services; and
transforming the output file into at least one of one or more native scripts or one or more configuration files for application on the target server.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. First, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Patterson does not teach or suggest, as claimed in Claim 19:

> obtaining a current configuration from a target server, the current configuration including *one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing*;
> assigning one of the one or more roles to the target server that the target server *is capable of performing*. (Emphasis added).

Second, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Patterson does not teach or suggest, "transforming the output file into at least one of one or more *native scripts* or one or more *configuration files* for application on the target server," as claimed in Claim 19.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, the method claimed in Claim 19 is not anticipated by Patterson. Moreover, since Claims 20-24 depend from Claim 19, they are allowable over the cited reference to Patterson at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations claimed.

Claims 25- 29

Claims 26-29 depend from Claim 25. Claim 25, as amended, recites:

> 25. An apparatus comprising:
> a pre-processor to receive information regarding server roles from a knowledge base and to receive characteristics of a target server, the characteristics including one or more roles that the target server is capable of performing, wherein the pre-processor generates a file that includes one of the one or more

roles that the target server is capable of performing, and wherein information in the file regarding services and ports associated with the server roles is presented to a user for selection; and

a configuration engine coupled to the pre-processor, wherein the configuration engine configures the target server based on the user's selection of services and ports.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Specifically, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), to the extent that the claims recite similar features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Patterson does not teach or suggest, "the characteristics including one or more *roles that the target server is capable of performing*," and "wherein the pre-processor generates a file that includes one of the one or more roles *that the target server is capable of performing*," as claimed in Claim 25. (Emphasis added).

Thus, for at least the above reasons, the apparatus claimed in claim 25 is not anticipated by Patterson. Moreover, since Claims 26-29 depend from Claim 25, they are allowable over the cited reference to Patterson at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations claimed.

Claims 30-34

Claims 31-34 depend from Claim 30. Claim 30, as amended, recites:

30. One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

identify one or more roles for a target server based on a security level selected from a plurality of security levels, wherein the number of one or more roles identified is dependent on a magnitude of the selected security level;

selecting one role from the one or more roles;

identify one or more services associated with the selected
 role;
identify one or more ports associated with the selected
 role;
display the identified services and ports associated with
 the selected role; and
receive selected services and ports to be activated on the
 target server.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Specifically, Claim 30, as amended, recites similar subject matter as amended Claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), to the extent that the claims recite similar features. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Patterson does not teach or suggest, "identify *one or more roles* for a target server based on *a security level selected from a plurality of security levels*, wherein the number of one or more roles identified is *dependent on a magnitude of the selected security level*," as claimed in Claim 30. (Emphasis added).

Thus, for at least the above reasons, the apparatus claimed in Claim 30 is not anticipated by Patterson. Moreover, since Claims 31-34 depend from Claim 30, they are allowable over the cited reference to Patterson at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations claimed.

In closing, Applicant's decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the conclusions set forth in the Office Action that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, Applicant's decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment set forth in the Office Action, should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the interpretation and

assertions presented in the Office Action regarding those claims. Indeed, Applicant believes that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that the above-proposed amendments be entered and that pending Claims 1-34 be allowed. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue..

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _8-11-08_   By: _____
David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222

Elliott Y. Chen
Reg. No. 58,293

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (206) 315-4001 x104
or   (206) 315-7914
Fax: (206) 315-4004